



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/743,112

01/16/2001

Hiroshi Kamakura

108100

5773

25944

7590

07/27/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 19928

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/743,112	Applicant(s) KAMAKURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kristie Shingles	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 17-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 17-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

No claims have been amended.

Claims 10 and 16 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 17-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments (see Remarks pages 2-4) filed 5/2/2006, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of: *Nakayama et al* (US 5,363,507) and *Tada et al* (US 5,572,728).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-4, 11-15, 17, 18, 23 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakayama et al* (US 5,363,507) in view of *Tada et al* (US 5,572,728).

a. **Regarding claim 1**, *Nakayama et al* teach a meeting system in which supplied-data convertible using a virtual machine is transmitted and received among a plurality of processing apparatuses interconnected via a transmission line, and in which meeting data is reproduced,

- at least two of said plurality of processing apparatuses comprising meeting data reproducing apparatus respectively, each meeting data reproducing apparatus reproducing meeting data that includes fixed presentation data and supplied-data, and the presentation data including at least one pointer indicating an address of the supplied-data so that a portion of the meeting data may be reproduced by specifying at least one of a particular presenter, a meeting participant and time (col.2 lines 9-67, col.5 lines 57-66, col.6 lines 44-50, col.7 lines 39-49, col.10 lines 43-61, col.11 lines 25-67, col.12 lines 3-23, col.15 lines 25-63);
- at least one meeting data reproducing apparatus comprising: a virtual machine that receives the supplied data from another one of the plurality of processing apparatus, reads files in a common format and performs operations specified in the files, the virtual machine converting said supplied-data into a data format which allows said meeting data to be reproduced, the meeting data being stored in units based on corresponding units of the supplied-data, (col.8 lines 4-33 and 50-63, col.16 lines 14-30; provision for meeting data reproducing and generating apparatus with virtual module and converting means for the participant's input data);
- a communication interface unit that receive said supplied-data from another processing apparatus (col.8 lines 4-28); and
- a storage unit in which a generated image is stored and which is accessibly by said another processing apparatus via said communication interface unit (col.6 lines 44-50, col.12 lines 18-33 and 54-59), and
- each of said at least one meeting data reproducing apparatus and said another meeting data reproducing apparatus including said conversion unit and said communication interface unit reading a part of said meeting data from said storage unit and reproducing meeting data in a task-distributed fashion (col.14 lines 11-18).

Nakayama et al fail to explicitly teach that each unit of the meeting data is identifiable by a specific processing apparatus that supplied a corresponding unit of the supplied-

data. However, *Tada et al* teach the data supplied by the presenter is identifiably associated with the type of input medium used by the presenter (col.7 line 47-col.8 line 6).

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* in order to associate the type of input medium/device used by the presenter/participant of a conference, because this allows the conference system to maintain precise records of the meeting data by specifically identifying the unique input data contributed from each presenter.

b. **Claims 2, 3 and 11-14** comprise limitations that are substantially similar to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 4**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 3, *Nakayama et al* further teach said supplied-data comprising at least one of image data for displaying said meeting data and control data for controlling the displaying of said meeting data, said meeting data reproducing apparatus comprising: a display unit that displays said meeting data in accordance with said image data; and a control unit that controls the displaying of said meeting data in accordance with said control data (col.7 lines 29-67, col.8 lines 34-63).

d. **Regarding claim 6**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 3, *Nakayama et al* further teach said meeting data generating apparatus comprising data control unit that stores the supplied-data, converted by said conversion unit, in said storage unit in which particular presentation data is stored while said supplied-data is managed in units of supplied-data received from each of said processing apparatuses, and reads meeting data including at least a part of said supplied-data and said presentation data from said storage unit in accordance with a reproduction command from each of said processing

Art Unit: 2141

apparatuses, and said communication interface unit comprising a transmitting unit that transmits the read meeting data to said meeting data reproducing apparatus (col.8 lines 4-33 and 50-63, col.16 lines 14-30; *Tada et al.*: col.7 line 47-col.8 line 6).

e. **Regarding claim 7**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 6, *Tada et al* further teach said meeting data reproducing apparatus reproducing said meeting data stored in said storage unit in units of data associated with said processing apparatus which supplies said supplied-data, in accordance with said reproduction command (col.7 line 47-col.8 line 6).

f. **Regarding claim 8**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 7, *Nakayama et al* further teach said meeting data generating apparatus comprising: an image-recording unit that records images of a meeting scene, and an image data unit that stores image data obtained as a result of the recording of images of the meeting scene in said storage unit as a part of said meeting data, in predetermined units of data, and said meeting data reproducing apparatus reproducing said meeting data stored in said storage unit, in predetermined units of data in accordance with said reproduction command (col.10 lines 62-68, col.11 lines 50-61; *Tada et al.*: col.7 lines 53-57, col.9 lines 35-50, col.10 lines 1-40).

g. **Regarding claim 15**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 14, *Nakayama et al* further teach said supplied-data comprising at least one of meeting data, an object for generating meeting data, an object for controlling the generation of meeting data, an object for reproducing meeting data, and an object for controlling the reproduction of meeting data (col.5 lines 25-66, col.7 lines 34-58, col.8 lines 15-68, col.16 lines 14-28).

h. **Regarding claim 17**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 1, *Nakayama et al* further teach at least two processing apparatuses being associated with at least two respective meeting participants, and each of the at least two processing apparatuses identifying a corresponding one of the at least two respective meeting participants (col.5 lines 25-33, col.8 lines 60-67, col.13 lines 32-49).

i. **Regarding claim 18**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 1, *Tada et al* further teach the generated image being generated based on the meeting data, and each of the at least one meeting data reproducing apparatus and the another meeting data reproducing apparatus simultaneously displaying different parts of the generated image on different sub-area of a display area (col.10 lines 9-64).

j. **Regarding claims 23 and 24**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claims 1 and 2, *Nakayama et al* further teach the supplied-data including time data (col.10 lines 44-47).

4. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakayama et al* (US 5,363,507) in view of *Tada et al* (US 5,572,728) and further in view of *Ichimura* (US 5,894,306).

Regarding claim 9, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the system according to claim 8, as applied above, yet fail to explicitly teach at least one of said meeting data generating apparatus and said meeting data reproducing apparatus comprising a projector. However, *Ichimura* teaches at least one of said meeting data generating apparatus and said meeting data reproducing apparatus comprising a projector (col.6 lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to

combine the teachings of *Nakayama et al* and *Tada et al* with *Ichimura* because a projector is a well-known apparatus used in conducting meetings, conferences and presentations. It would have been obvious to implement the meeting systems using a projector as a source of data reproduction.

5. **Claims 5 and 19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakayama et al* (US 5,363,507) in view of *Tada et al* (US 5,572,728) and further in view of *Colyer et al* (US 6,151,621).

a. **Regarding claim 5**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claim 3, as applied above. *Nakayama et al* further teaches conferencing programs to control generating the meeting data (col.5 lines 49-66, col.7 lines 29-58, col.8 lines 15-68), yet fail to explicitly disclose a server. However, *Colyer et al* disclose a conferencing system utilizing a server with programs to generate the meeting data and manage the objects of the conference (Abstract, col.6 lines 10-43). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Nakayama et al* and *Tada et al* with *Colyer et al* by provisioning the managing functions of a server to allow for centralized control of the objects and data of the conference.

b. **Regarding claims 19-22**, *Nakayama et al* with *Tada et al* teach the meeting system according to claims 1-3 and 11, as applied above. *Nakayama et al* teach a conferencing system utilizing a virtual module (col.8 lines 1-60); yet fail to explicitly teach a JAVA virtual machine. However, *Colyer et al* teach a conferencing system comprising a JAVA virtual machine (col.6 lines 20-29 and 44-52). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Nakayama et al* and *Tada et al* with *Colyer et al* because using the virtual machine (JAVA virtual machine) allows for simpler implementation of data conversion, without additional

overhead, the JAVA virtual machine creates a platform-independent interface thus allowing for operating system/platform portability of a conference.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Roseman (6,608,636), Bieselin et al (5,559,875), Naef III (5,206,934), Larson et al (5,907,324), Kitagawa (6,304,283), Moriyasu et al (5,799,191), Namikata et al (5,996,003), Katsurabayashi et al (5,996,002), Hussein et al (7,007,235).


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER